

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-4 and 6-12 are amended and claims 13-19 are added. Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

I. Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 4-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. patent number 5,926,103 to Petite (herein “Petite”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In a non-limiting example, in the present application, photographed data is accepted from a user. The photographed data includes photographing position information, which is used to insert content corresponding to the photographing position information into the photographed data. As an advantage, if the user misses the chance to photograph things peculiar to a photographed place, the content may later be inserted into the photographed data.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “data symbolizing an area which corresponds to the photographing position information and in which the photographed data is originally obtained,” support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 3, lines 1-6. Independent claims 4 and 6-12 and new claim 19 include similar features.

In contrast, Petite only discusses a security system in which a remote receiver forwards data specific to a person to emergency personnel. The emergency personnel then use the data to determine the person’s location. Petite at col. 2, lines 35-38 only discusses that data including, for example, a person’s address (see Petite at col. 2, lines 25-29) is transmitted by a transmitter, and a remote receiver uses the data to look up closest emergency personnel. However, Petite does not discuss or suggest accepting photographed data, as in the pending independent claims.

Moreover, Petite at col. 2, lines 25-38 only discusses static information such as a person’s address and name. However, Petite does not discuss or suggest that “data symbolizing an area which corresponds to the photographing position information and in which the photographed data is originally obtained” is accepted from a user, as in the pending independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 4, 6-12, new independent claim 19 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Petite.

II Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Petite and U.S. patent number 6,173,407 to Yoon et al. (herein “Yoon”), and claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Petite and U.S. patent number 5,801,750 to Kurihara (herein “Kurihara”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend on independent claim 1, which as discussed is believed to patentably distinguish over Petite. Further, Yoon only discusses charging a client using a web infoshop service, and Kurihara only discusses a system for reducing the effect of a user’s skill level on the cost of information retrieval, but neither Yoon nor Kurihara discuss or suggest the features of the pending claims.

Moreover, dependent claims 2 and 3 include further patentably distinguishing features. For example, claim 3 recites “transmitting the inserted and edited photographed data to the user based on the accepted information for specifying the user.” However, neither Petite nor Kurihara discuss or suggest at least editing photographed data, as in dependent claim 3.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 2 and 3 also patentably distinguish over Petite and Yoon and Petite and Kurihara, respectively.

III. New Claims

In addition, new claims 13-19 are added to set forth the invention in a varying scope. New claims 13, 15 and 17 recite “transmitting the inserted and edited photographed data to the user based on information specifying the user, to increase a value of the photographed data as a commemorative photograph” in which “the photographed data accepted from the user includes the information specifying the user,” support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 3, lines 7-13. New claims 14, 16 and 18 are similar to claim 2, but depend on new claims 13, 15 and 17. Also, new claim 19 is directed to an image processing system and includes similar features to claim 1. It is believed no new matter is added.

IV. Amendment to the Specification

Also, the specification is amended to correct minor informalities. It is believed no new matter is added.

V. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 12, 2004

By: Ryan Rafferty
Ryan M. Rafferty
Registration No. 55,556

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501